arXiv:0810.3445v3 [math.AP] 20 Apr 2009

GLOBAL WELL-POSEDNESS OF KORTEWEG-DE VRIES EQUATION IN $H^{-3/4}(\mathbb{R})$

ZIHUA GUO

Abstract. We prove that the Korteweg-de Vries initial-value problem is globally well-posed in $H^{-3/4}(\mathbb{R})$ and the modified Korteweg-de Vries initial-value problem is globally well-posed in $H^{1/4}(\mathbb{R})$. The new ingredient is that we use directly the contraction principle to prove local well-posedness for KdV equation in $H^{-3/4}$ by constructing some special resolution spaces in order to avoid some 'logarithmic divergence' from the high-high interactions. Our local solution has almost the same properties as those for H^s $(s>-3/4)$ solution which enable us to apply the I-method to extend it to a global solution.

1. Introduction

This paper is mainly concerned with the well-known open problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation: global well-posedness holds in $H^{-3/4}$ (cf. [5], [4])? The Korteweg-de Vries (KdV) equation

$$\begin{cases} u_t+u_{xxx}-3(u^2)_x=0, \quad u(x,t):\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R},\\ u(x,0)=\phi(x)\in H^s(\mathbb{R}), \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

has attracted extensive attentions, since it was first derived by D. J. Korteweg and G. de Vries [17] as a model for unidirectional propagation of nonlinear dispersive long waves. A large amount of works have been devoted to the Cauchy problem (1.1) and meanwhile many useful tools and methods were discovered and developed. We only mention here the most recent results concerned with the well-posedness. A first result by using contraction principle was due to Kenig, Ponce and Vega [10] who obtained local well-posedness in H^s for $s>3/4$. Bourgain [2] extended this result to global well-posedness in L^2 by developing the $X^{s,b}$ space. Then by developing the bilinear estimates in $X^{s,b}$ space Kenig, Ponce and Vega [12] were able to prove local well-posedness in H^s for $s>-3/4$ and Colliander, Keel, Staffilani, Takaoka and Tao [5] extended it to a global result where $I-method$ was introduced. It is worth noting that $H^{-3/4}$ is the sharp regularity for a strong well-posedness. Christ, Colliander, and Tao [4] proved that the KdV solution map of (1.1) fails to be uniformly continuous in H^s for $s<-3/4$ which was first proved by Kenig, Ponce and Vega [11] for the complex-valued problem.

On the other hand, analogous analysis above were also devoted to the modified KdV (mKdV) equation

$$u_t+u_{xxx}\pm 2(u^3)_x=0, \quad u(x,0)=\phi(x). \tag{1.2}$$

It is well-known that under the Miura transform $v=M(u)=\partial_x u+u^2$ for $'-'$ ($\partial_x u+iu^2$ for '+') where u is a solution to (1.2), then v satisfies the KdV equation (1.1)

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q53,35L30.

Key words and phrases. Korteweg-de Vries equation, Global well-posedness, Low regularity.

(with some different coefficient in the nonlinearity). Thus we see from the Miura transform that mKdV requires 1-order higher regularity than the KdV equation. But mKdV has better result at the endpoint $s = 1/4$, since it has better high-high interactions. It is known that the mKdV equation (1.2) is locally well-posed in H^s for $s \geq 1/4$ [12] and globally well-posed for $s > 1/4$ [5]. The $H^{1/4}$ well-posedness for the defocusing mKdV equation combined with the Miura transform established a local well-posedness result for KdV in $H^{-3/4}$ [4]. Global well-posedness of KdV at $H^{-3/4}$ and for mKdV in $H^{1/4}$ remain open problems.

In this paper we intend to study the global well-posedness of KdV at $s = -3/4$ and of mKdV at $s = 1/4$. Generally, there are two approaches to this problem. The main reason that the $H^{-3/4}$ local solution of KdV in [4] can not be extended to a global solution by using the I-method is that the local solution doesn't have as many properties as the H^s local solution for $s > -3/4$. These properties are crucial in I-method to estimate the multi-linear forms and hence control the increase of the modified energy. However, on the other hand, the $H^{1/4}$ local solution of mKdV was derived by direct contraction principle and thus has many properties. Therefore it is expected that one may follow the ideas of I-method to directly study mKdV to get global well-posedness in $H^{1/4}$ and then prove global well-posedness for KdV. One need to estimate a four or perhaps higher linear form. The other approach is to prove a strong local well-posedness for the KdV at $s = -3/4$. This is possible because the solution map is locally uniformly continuous (actually analytic) in $H^{-3/4}$ although the uniform continuity fails in H^s if $s < -3/4$. We will adapt the second approach. We construct a strong local solution by contraction principle. Now we state our main results:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume* $\phi \in H^{-3/4}$. *Then*

(a) Existence. There exist $T = T(\|\phi\|_{H^{-3/4}}) > 0$ *and a solution* u *to the Cauchy problem* (1.1) *satisfying*

$$u \in \bar{F}^s(T) \subset C([-T,T] : H^{-3/4}).$$

(b) Uniqueness. The solution mapping $S_T : \phi \to u$ *is the unique extension of the classical solution* $H^\infty \to C([-T,T] : H^\infty)$.

(c) Lipschitz continuity. For any $R > 0$, *the mapping* $\phi \to u$ *is Lipschitz continuous from* $\{u_0 \in H^{-3/4} : \|u_0\|_{H^{-3/4}} < R\}$ *to* $C([-T,T] : H^{-3/4})$.

(d) Persistence of Regularity. If in addition $\phi \in H^s$ *for some* $s > -3/4$, *then the solution* $u \in H^s$.

We remark that Theorem 1.1 also holds for the complex-valued KdV equation. From Theorem 1.1 (b) and (d) we get that our local solution coincide with the one in [4], and we also prove it belongs to a strong class $\bar{F}^s(T)$. With this we are able to use I-method to extend it to a global solution.

Theorem 1.2. *The KdV equation* (1.1) *is globally well-posed in* $H^{-3/4}$ *and the mKdV equation* (1.2) *is globally well-posed in* $H^{1/4}$.

By 'globally well-posed' for KdV in Theorem 1.2 we mean T can be any large real number in Theorem 1.1 and similarly for mKdV. We will prove Theorem 1.2 by using the I-method and a variant version of Theorem 1.1. Now we sketch our ideas in proving Theorem 1.1. Our starting point is the fundamental bilinear estimates in $X^{s,b}$ space (see next section for the definition of $X^{s,b}$):

$$\|\partial_x(uv)\|_{X^{s,b-1}} \leq C\|u\|_{X^{s,b}}\|v\|_{X^{s,b}}. \tag{1.3}$$

The bilinear estimates (1.3) play a crucial role in [12] to apply a fixed point argument. It was proved in [12] that (1.3) hold for some $b > 1/2$ if $s > -3/4$ and fail for any b if $s < -3/4$. For $s = -3/4$, the bilinear estimates (1.3) also fail for any b which was due to Nakanishi, Takaoka and Tsutsumi [19]. In view of this, we study instead the bilinear estimates in l^1-type $X^{s,b}$ space F^s inspired by our work [7]. We find that the bilinear estimates in $F^{-3/4}$ almost hold except some potential logarithmic divergences from *high* × *high* → *low* interactions. Fortunately, we find that we are still able to control the *high* × *low* interactions if assuming some weaker structure on the low frequency. Using the weaker structure we are then able to control the *high* × *high* interactions.

Our methods can also be adapted to the other similar problems where some logarithmic divergences appear in the high-high interactions. One interesting problem is the global well-posedness for the KdV-burger equations in H^{-1}:

$$u_t + u_{xxx} - \epsilon u_{xx} - 3(u^2)_x = 0, \quad u(x,0) = \phi(x). \tag{1.4}$$

The equation (1.4) is showed in [18] to be globally well-posed in H^s for $s > -1$ and C^2 ill-posed for $s < -1$, but H^{-1} well-posedness remains a open problem. Some new ideas should be developed to this problem. One may also follow the methods here and the ideas in [7] to prove the inviscid limit in $C([-T,T] : H^{-3/4})$ as ϵ tends to zero. We do not pursue this in this paper.

Remark 1.3. After this paper was published, the author learned that Nobu Kishimoto [16] also obtained similar results with different resolution spaces by using some ideas in [1]. The author would like to thank him for valuable discussion.

The rest of the paper is organized as following. In Section 2 we present some notations and Banach function spaces. We present some dyadic bilinear estimates in Section 3. The proof of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2 is given in Section 4.

2. NOTATION AND DEFINITIONS

For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \sim y$ means that there exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that $C_1|x| \leq |y| \leq C_2|x|$. For $f \in \mathcal{S}'$ we denote by $\widehat{f}$ or $\mathcal{F}(f)$ the Fourier transform of f for both spatial and time variables,

$$\widehat{f}(\xi,\tau) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-ix\xi} e^{-it\tau} f(x,t)\,dxdt.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{F}_x$ the Fourier transform on spatial variable and if there is no confusion, we still write $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_x$. Let $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{N}$ be the sets of integers and natural numbers, respectively. $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ let

$$I_k = \{\xi : |\xi| \in [2^{k-1}, 2^{k+1}]\},\ k \geq 1; \quad I_0 = \{\xi : |\xi| \leq 2\}.$$

Let $\eta_0 : \mathbb{R} \to [0,1]$ denote an even smooth function supported in $[-8/5, 8/5]$ and equal to 1 in $[-5/4, 5/4]$. We define $\psi(t) = \eta_0(t)$. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $\eta_k(\xi) = \eta_0(\xi/2^k) - \eta_0(\xi/2^{k-1})$ if $k \geq 1$ and $\eta_k(\xi) \equiv 0$ if $k \leq -1$. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $\chi_k(\xi) = \eta_0(\xi/2^k) - \eta_0(\xi/2^{k-1})$. Roughly speaking, $\{\chi_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is the homogeneous decomposition function sequence and $\{\eta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ is the non-homogeneous decomposition function sequence to the frequency space. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ let P_k denote the operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ defined by

$$\widehat{P_k u}(\xi) = \eta_k(\xi)\widehat{u}(\xi).$$

By a slight abuse of notation we also define the operator P_k on $L^2(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R})$ by the formula $\mathcal{F}(P_k u)(\xi,\tau)=\eta_k(\xi)\mathcal{F}(u)(\xi,\tau)$. For $l\in\mathbb{Z}$ let

$$P_{\leq l}=\sum_{k\leq l}P_k,\quad P_{\geq l}=\sum_{k\geq l}P_k.$$

Thus we see that $P_{\leq 0}=P_0$.

For $u_0\in\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$, we denote by $W(t)u_0=e^{-t\partial_x^3}u_0$ the free solution of linear Airy equation which is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_x(W(t)\phi)(\xi)=\exp[i\xi^3 t]\widehat{\phi}(\xi),\ \forall\ t\in\mathbb{R}.$$

We define the Lebesgue spaces $L^q_{t\in I}L^p_x$ and $L^p_xL^q_{t\in I}$ by the norms

$$\|f\|_{L^q_{t\in I}L^p_x}=\big\|\|f\|_{L^p_x}\big\|_{L^q_t(I)},\quad \|f\|_{L^p_xL^q_{t\in I}}=\big\|\|f\|_{L^q_t(I)}\big\|_{L^p_x}. \tag{2.1}$$

If $I=\mathbb{R}$ we simply write $L^q_tL^p_x$ and $L^p_xL^q_t$. We will make use of the $X^{s,b}$ norm associated to the KdV equation (1.1) which is given by

$$\|u\|_{X^{s,b}}=\|\langle\tau-\xi^3\rangle^b\langle\xi\rangle^s\widehat{u}(\xi,\tau)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)},$$

where $\langle\cdot\rangle=(1+|\cdot|^2)^{1/2}$. The spaces $X^{s,b}$ turn out to be very useful in the study of low-regularity theory for the dispersive equations. These spaces were first used to systematically study nonlinear dispersive wave problems by Bourgain [5] and developed by Kenig, Ponce and Vega [12] and Tao [20]. Klainerman and Machedon [15] used similar ideas in their study of the nonlinear wave equation.

In applications we usually apply $X^{s,b}$ space for b is very close to $1/2$. In the case $b=1/2$ one has a good substitute-l^1 type $X^{s,b}$ space. For $k\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ we define the dyadic $X^{s,b}$-type normed spaces $X_k=X_k(\mathbb{R}^2)$,

$$X_k=\left\{f\in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2):\ \begin{array}{l} f(\xi,\tau)\text{ is supported in } I_k\times\mathbb{R}\text{ and}\\ \|f\|_{X_k}=\sum_{j=0}^\infty 2^{j/2}\|\eta_j(\tau-\xi^3)\cdot f\|_{L^2}.\end{array}\right\} \tag{2.2}$$

Then we define the l^1-analogue of $X^{s,b}$ space F^s by

$$\|u\|^2_{F^s}=\sum_{k\geq 0}2^{2sk}\|\eta_k(\xi)\mathcal{F}(u)\|^2_{X_k}. \tag{2.3}$$

Structures of this kind of spaces were introduced, for instance, in [22], [9] and [8] for the BO equation. The space F^s is better than $X^{s,1/2}$ in many situations for several reasons. F^s can be embedded into $C(\mathbb{R};H^s)$ and into the Strichartz-type space, say $L^p_tL^q_x$ as $X^{s,1/2+}$ (see Lemma 3.2 below). On the other hand, it has the same scaling in time as $X^{s,1/2}$, which was recently exploited by us [7] in the inviscid limit problem for KdV-burgers equation. This is similar to the difference between $\dot{B}^{n/2}_{2,1}$ and $\dot{H}^{n/2}$. Tao [21] used a homogenous version to prove scattering for generalized KdV equation for small critical data. From the definition of X_k, we see that for any $l\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ and $f_k\in X_k$ (see also [9]),

$$\sum_{j=0}^\infty 2^{j/2}\left\|\eta_j(\tau-\xi^3)\int|f_k(\xi,\tau')|2^{-l}(1+2^{-l}|\tau-\tau'|)^{-4}d\tau'\right\|_{L^2}\lesssim\|f_k\|_{X_k}. \tag{2.4}$$

Hence for any $l\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, $t_0\in\mathbb{R}$, $f_k\in X_k$, and $\gamma\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, then

$$\|\mathcal{F}[\gamma(2^l(t-t_0))\cdot\mathcal{F}^{-1}f_k]\|_{X_k}\lesssim\|f_k\|_{X_k}. \tag{2.5}$$

In order to avoid some logarithmic divergence, we need to use a weaker norm for the low frequency

$$\|u\|_{\bar{X}_0}=\|u\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_t}.$$

It is easy to see from Proposition 3.3 that

$$\|\eta_0(t)P_{\le 0}u\|_{\bar{X}_0}\lesssim\|P_{\le 0}u\|_{X_0}. \tag{2.6}$$

On the other hand, for any $1\le q\le\infty$ and $2\le r\le\infty$ we have

$$\|P_{\le 0}u\|_{L^q_{|t|\le T}L^r_x\cap L^r_x L^q_{|t|\le T}}\lesssim_T\|P_{\le 0}u\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_{|t|\le T}}. \tag{2.7}$$

For $-3/4\le s\le 0$, we define the our resolution spaces

$$\bar{F}^s=\{u\in\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2):\|u\|^2_{\bar{F}^s}=\sum_{k\ge 1}2^{2sk}\|\eta_k(\xi)\mathcal{F}(u)\|^2_{X_k}+\|P_{\le 0}(u)\|^2_{\bar{X}_0}<\infty\}.$$

For $T\ge 0$, we define the time-localized spaces $\bar{F}^s(T)$:

$$\|u\|_{\bar{F}^s(T)}=\inf_{w\in\bar{F}^s}\{\|P_{\le 0}u\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_{|t|\le T}}+\|P_{\ge 1}w\|_{\bar{F}^s},\ w(t)=u(t)\text{ on }[-T,T]\}. \tag{2.8}$$

Let $a_1,a_2,a_3\in\mathbb{R}$. It will be convenient to define the quantities $a_{max}\ge a_{med}\ge a_{min}$ to be the maximum, median, and minimum of a_1,a_2,a_3 respectively. Usually we use k_1,k_2,k_3 and j_1,j_2,j_3 to denote integers, $N_i=2^{k_i}$ and $L_i=2^{j_i}$ for $i=1,2,3$ to denote dyadic numbers.

3. Dyadic Bilinear Estimates

In this section we prove some dyadic bilinear estimates which are crucial for applying contraction principle in the next section. We will need the estimates for the free solution to the KdV equation. We recall in the following lemma the Strichartz estimates, maximal function estimates and smoothing effect estimate for the free KdV solution and refer the readers to [6, 14, 13] for their proof.

Lemma 3.1 (Estimates for free KdV solutions)**.** *Let $I\subset\mathbb{R}$ be a interval with $|I|\lesssim 1$ and $k\in\mathbb{Z}_+$. Then for all $\phi\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ we have*

$$\|W(t)\phi\|_{L^q_t L^r_x}\lesssim\|\phi\|_{L^2}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\|W(t)P_k(\phi)\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_{t\in I}}\lesssim 2^{3k/4}\|\phi\|_{L^2}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\|W(t)\phi\|_{L^4_x L^\infty_t}\lesssim\|\phi\|_{\dot{H}^{1/4}}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\|W(t)\phi\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_t}\lesssim\|\phi\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}}, \tag{3.4}$$

where (q,r) satisfies $2\le q,r\le\infty$ and $3/q=1/2-1/r$.

As was said in the introduction, F^s can be embedded into many space-time spaces. We prove a variant version of Lemma 4.1 in [21].

Lemma 3.2 (Extension lemma)**.** *Let Y be any space-time Banach space which obeys the time modulation estimate*

$$\|g(t)F(t,x)\|_Y\le\|g\|_{L^\infty_t}\|F(t,x)\|_Y \tag{3.5}$$

for any $F\in Y$ and $g\in L^\infty_t$. Moreover, if for all $u_0\in L^2_x$

$$\|W(t)u_0\|_Y\lesssim\|u_0\|_{L^2_x}.$$

Then one also has the estimate that for all $k\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ and $u\in F^0$

$$\|P_k(u)\|_Y\lesssim\|\widehat{P_k(u)}\|_{X_k}.$$

Proof. Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and let $u \in F^0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_k u &= \int \eta_k(\xi) \mathcal{F}u(\xi,\tau) e^{ix\xi} e^{it\tau} d\xi d\tau \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int \eta_j(\tau - \xi^3) \eta_k(\xi) \mathcal{F}u(\xi,\tau) e^{ix\xi} e^{it\tau} d\xi d\tau \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int \eta_j(\tau) e^{it\tau} \int \eta_k(\xi) \mathcal{F}u(\xi,\tau+\xi^3) e^{ix\xi} e^{it\xi^3} d\xi d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Then from the assumption we get

$$\|P_k(u)\|_Y \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_j(\tau) \|\eta_k(\xi) \mathcal{F}u(\xi,\tau+\xi^3)\|_{L^2_\xi} d\tau \lesssim \|\widehat{P_k(u)}\|_{X_k}.$$

Therefore, we complete the proof of the lemma. ■

Using Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 we immediately get

Proposition 3.3 (X_k embedding)**.** *Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and (q,r) as in Lemma 3.1. Assume $u \in F^0$, then we have*

$$\|P_k(u)\|_{L^q_t L^r_x} \lesssim \|\mathcal{F}[P_k(u)]\|_{X_k}, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\|P_k(u)\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_{t\in I}} \lesssim 2^{3k/4} \|\mathcal{F}[P_k(u)]\|_{X_k}, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\|P_k(u)\|_{L^4_x L^\infty_t} \lesssim 2^{k/4} \|\mathcal{F}[P_k(u)]\|_{X_k}, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\|P_j(u)\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_t} \lesssim 2^{-j} \|\mathcal{F}[P_j(u)]\|_{X_j}, \tag{3.9}$$

As a consequence, we get from the definition that for $u \in \bar{F}^s$

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty_t H^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{\bar{F}^s}.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ we define

$$D_{k,j} = \{(\xi,\tau) : \xi \in [2^{k-1}, 2^{k+1}] \text{ and } \tau - \xi^3 \in I_j\}.$$

Following the $[k;Z]$ methods [20] the bilinear estimates in $X^{s,b}$ space reduce to some dyadic summations and estimates on the operator norm: for any $k_1, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

$$\sup_{(u_{k_2,j_2},\ v_{k_3,j_3}) \in E} \|1_{D_{k_1,j_1}}(\xi,\tau) \cdot u_{k_2,j_2} * v_{k_3,j_3}(\xi,\tau)\|_{L^2_{\xi,\tau}} \tag{3.10}$$

where the supremum is taken over on E

$$E = \{(u,v) : \|u\|_2,\ \|v\|_2 \le 1 \text{ and } \mathrm{supp}(u) \subset D_{k_2,j_2},\ \mathrm{supp}(v) \subset D_{k_3,j_3}\}.$$

By checking the support properties, we get that in order for (3.10) to be nonzero one must have

$$|k_{max} - k_{med}| \le 3, \tag{3.11}$$

$$2^{j_{max}} \sim \max(2^{j_{med}}, 2^{k^2_{max} k_{min}}). \tag{3.12}$$

Sharp estimates on (3.10) were obtained in [20]. We will use these to prove the dyadic bilinear estimates.

Proposition 3.4 (Proposition 6.1, [20])**.** *Let* $k_1, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ *obey* (3.11) *and* (3.12). *Let* $N_i = 2^{k_i}$ *and* $L_i = 2^{j_i}$ *for* $i = 1, 2, 3$. *Then*

(i) If $N_{max} \sim N_{min}$ *and* $L_{max} \sim N_{max}^2 N_{min}$, *then we have*

$$(3.10) \lesssim L_{min}^{1/2} N_{max}^{-1/4} L_{med}^{1/4}. \tag{3.13}$$

(ii) If $N_2 \sim N_3 \gg N_1$ *and* $N_{max}^2 N_{min} \sim L_1 \gtrsim L_2, L_3$, *then*

$$(3.10) \lesssim L_{min}^{1/2} N_{max}^{-1} \min(N_{max}^2 N_{min}, \frac{N_{max}}{N_{min}} L_{med})^{1/2}. \tag{3.14}$$

Similarly for permutations.

(iii) In all other cases, we have

$$(3.10) \lesssim L_{min}^{1/2} N_{max}^{-1} \min(N_{max}^2 N_{min}, L_{med})^{1/2}. \tag{3.15}$$

Now we are ready to prove our dyadic bilinear estimates. The first case is high-low interactions

Proposition 3.5 (high-low)**.** *(a) If* $k \geq 10$, $|k - k_2| \leq 5$, *then for any* $u, v \in \bar{F}^s$

$$\|(i + \tau - \xi^3)^{-1} \eta_k(\xi) i\xi \widehat{P_{\leq 0} u} * \widehat{P_{k_2} v}\|_{X_k} \lesssim \|P_{\leq 0} u\|_{L_x^2 L_t^\infty} \|\widehat{P_{k_2} v}\|_{X_{k_2}}. \tag{3.16}$$

(b) If $k \geq 10$, $|k - k_2| \leq 5$ *and* $1 \leq k_1 \leq k - 9$. *Then for any* $u, v \in \bar{F}^s$

$$\|(i + \tau - \xi^3)^{-1} \eta_k(\xi) i\xi \widehat{P_{k_1} u} * \widehat{P_{k_2} v}\|_{X_k} \lesssim k^3 2^{-k/2} 2^{-k_1} \|\widehat{P_{k_1} u}\|_{X_{k_1}} \|\widehat{P_{k_2} v}\|_{X_{k_2}}. \tag{3.17}$$

Proof. For simplicity of notations we assume $k = k_2$. For part (a), it follows from the definition of X_k that

$$\|(i + \tau - \xi^3)^{-1} \eta_k(\xi) i\xi \widehat{P_0 u} * \widehat{P_k v}\|_{X_k} \lesssim 2^k \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \|\widehat{P_0 u} * \widehat{P_{k_2} v}\|_{L^2_{\xi,\tau}}. \tag{3.18}$$

From Plancherel's equality and Proposition 3.3 we get

$$2^k \|\widehat{P_0 u} * \widehat{P_{k_2} v}\|_{L^2_{\xi,\tau}} \lesssim 2^k \|P_0 u\|_{L_x^2 L_t^\infty} \|P_k u\|_{L_x^\infty L_t^2} \lesssim \|P_0 u\|_{L_x^2 L_t^\infty} \|\widehat{P_k v}\|_{X_k},$$

which is part (a) as desired. For part (b), from the definition we get

$$\|(i + \tau - \xi^3)^{-1} \eta_k(\xi) i\xi \widehat{P_{k_1} u} * \widehat{P_k v}\|_{X_k} \lesssim 2^k \sum_{j_i \geq 0} 2^{-j_3/2} \|1_{D_{k,j_3}} \cdot u_{k_1,j_1} * v_{k,j_2}\|_2, \tag{3.19}$$

where

$$u_{k_1,j_1} = \eta_{k_1}(\xi) \eta_{j_1}(\tau - \xi^3) \widehat{u}, \ v_{k,j_2} = \eta_k(\xi) \eta_{j_2}(\tau - \xi^3) \widehat{v}. \tag{3.20}$$

From (3.12) we may assume $j_{max} \geq 2k + k_1 - 10$ in the summation on the right-hand side of (3.19). We may also assume $j_1, j_2, j_3 \leq 10k$, since otherwise we will apply the trivial estimates

$$\|1_{D_{k_3,j_3}} \cdot u_{k_1,j_1} * v_{k,j_2}\|_2 \lesssim 2^{j_{min}/2} 2^{k_{min}/2} \|u_{k_1,j_1}\|_2 \|u_{k_2,j_2}\|_2,$$

then there is a 2^{-5k} to spare which suffices to give the bound (3.17). Thus by applying (3.14) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&2^k \sum_{j_3,j_1,j_2\geq 0} 2^{-j_3/2}\|1_{D_{k,j}} u_{k_1,j_1} * v_{k,j_2}\|_2\\
&\lesssim 2^k \sum_{j_3,j_1,j_2\geq 0} 2^{-j/2}2^{j_{min}/2}2^{-k/2}2^{-k_1/2}2^{j_{med}/2}\|u_{k_1,j_1}\|_2\|v_{k,j_2}\|_2\\
&\lesssim 2^k \sum_{j_{max}\geq 2k+k_1-10} k^3 2^{-k/2}2^{-k_1/2}2^{-j_{max}/2}\|\widehat{P_{k_1}u}\|_{X_{k_1}}\|\widehat{P_k v}\|_{X_k}\\
&\lesssim k^3 2^{-k/2}2^{-k_1}\|\widehat{P_{k_1}u}\|_{X_{k_1}}\|\widehat{P_k v}\|_{X_k}, \qquad (3.21)
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the proposition. ■

In [7] we proved a similar result as part (a) but with $\|P_0 u\|_{L_x^2 L_t^\infty}$ replaced by $\|\widehat{P_0 u}\|_{X_0}$ on the right-hand side of (3.16). Then we see from (2.6) that the high-low interactions are still under control if we assume a little weaker structure on the low frequency. When the low frequency is comparable to the high frequency, then we have the following

Proposition 3.6. *If $k \geq 10$, $|k-k_2| \leq 5$ and $k-9 \leq k_1 \leq k+10$, then for any $u,\ v \in F^{-3/4}$*

$$\|(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_{k_1}(\xi) i\xi \widehat{P_k u} * \widehat{P_{k_2} v}\|_{X_{k_1}} \lesssim 2^{-3k/4}\|\widehat{P_k u}\|_{X_k}\|\widehat{P_{k_2} v}\|_{X_{k_2}}. \qquad (3.22)$$

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 3.5 we assume $k = k_2$ and it follows from the definition of X_{k_1} that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_{k_1}(\xi) i\xi \widehat{P_k u} * \widehat{P_k v}\|_{X_{k_1}}\\
&\lesssim 2^{k_1}\sum_{j_1,j_2,j_3\geq 0} 2^{-j_1/2}\|1_{D_{k_1,j_1}} u_{k,j_2} * v_{k,j_3}\|_2, \qquad (3.23)
\end{aligned}$$

where u_{k,j_1}, v_{k,j_2} are as in (3.20) and we may assume $j_{max} \geq 3k-20$ and $j_1, j_2, j_3 \leq 10k$ in the summation. Applying (3.13) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&2^{k_1}\sum_{j_1,j_2,j_3\geq 0} 2^{-j_1/2}\|1_{D_{k_1,j_1}} u_{k,j_2} * v_{k,j_3}\|_2\\
&\lesssim \Big(\sum_{j_1=j_{max}} + \sum_{j_2=j_{max}} + \sum_{j_3=j_{max}}\Big) 2^{-j_1/2}2^{3k/4}2^{j_{min}/2}2^{j_{med}/4}\|u_{k,j_2}\|_2\|v_{k,j_3}\|_2\\
&:= I + II + III.
\end{aligned}$$

For the contribution of I, since it is easy to get the bound, thus we omit the details. We only need to bound II in view of the symmetry. We get that

$$\begin{aligned}
II \quad &\lesssim \quad \Big(\sum_{j_2=j_{max}, j_1\leq j_3} + \sum_{j_2=j_{max}, j_1\geq j_3}\Big) 2^{-j_1/2}2^{3k/4}2^{j_{min}/2}2^{j_{med}/4}\|u_{k,j_2}\|_2\|v_{k,j_3}\|_2\\
&:= \quad II_1 + II_2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the contribution of II_1, by summing on j_1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} II_1 &\lesssim \sum_{j_2=j_{max}, j_1\le j_3} 2^{-j_1/2}2^{3k/4}2^{j_1/2}2^{j_3/4}\|u_{k,j_2}\|_2\|v_{k,j_3}\|_2\\ &\lesssim \sum_{j_2\ge 3k-20, j_3\ge 0} 2^{3k/4}2^{j_3/2}\|u_{k,j_2}\|_2\|v_{k,j_3}\|_2\\ &\lesssim 2^{-3k/4}\|\widehat{P_k u}\|_{X_k}\|\widehat{P_{k_2} v}\|_{X_{k_2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which is acceptable. For the contribution of II_2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} II_2 &\lesssim \sum_{j_2=j_{max}, j_1\ge j_3} 2^{-j_1/2}2^{3k/4}2^{j_3/2}2^{j_1/4}\|u_{k,j_2}\|_2\|v_{k,j_3}\|_2\\ &\lesssim 2^{-3k/4}\|\widehat{P_k u}\|_{X_k}\|\widehat{P_{k_2} v}\|_{X_{k_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we complete the proof of the proposition. ∎

We consider now *low* × *low*→*low* interaction. Generally speaking, this case is always easy to handle in many situations.

Proposition 3.7 (low-low)**.** *If* $0\le k_1,k_2,k_3\le 100$, *then for any* $u,\ v\in F^s$

$$\|(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_{k_1}(\xi)i\xi\widehat{\psi(t)P_{k_2}(u)}*\widehat{P_{k_3}(v)}\|_{X_{k_1}}\lesssim\|P_{k_2}u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\|P_{k_3}v\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}. \tag{3.24}$$

Proof. From the definition of X_{k_1}, Plancherel's equality and Bernstein's inequality we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_{k_1}(\xi)i\xi\mathcal{F}[\psi(t)P_{k_2}u]*\mathcal{F}[P_{k_3}v](\xi,\tau)\|_{X_{k_1}}\\ &\lesssim 2^{k_1}\sum_{j_3\ge 0}2^{-j_3/2}\|\psi(t)P_{k_2}u\cdot P_{k_3}v\|_{L_t^2L_x^2}\\ &\lesssim\|P_{k_2}u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\|P_{k_3}v\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the Proposition. ∎

The final case is *high* × *high* → *low* interactions. It is easy to see that this case is the worst, since $s<0$ and $\|u\|_{F^s}, \|v\|_{F^s}$ are small for u,v with very high frequency.

Proposition 3.8 (high-high)**.** *(a) If* $k\ge 10$, $|k-k_2|\le 5$, *then for any* $u,\ v\in F^s$

$$\|(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_0(\xi)i\xi\widehat{P_k u}*\widehat{P_{k_2}v}\|_{X_0}\lesssim k2^{-3k/2}\|\widehat{P_k u}\|_{X_k}\|\widehat{P_{k_2}v}\|_{X_{k_2}}. \tag{3.25}$$

(b) If $k\ge 10$, $|k-k_2|\le 5$ *and* $1\le k_1\le k-9$, *then for any* $u,\ v\in F^s$

$$\|(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_{k_1}(\xi)i\xi\widehat{P_k u}*\widehat{P_{k_2}v}\|_{X_{k_1}}\lesssim(2^{-3k/2}+k2^{-2k+\frac{k_1}{2}})\|\widehat{P_k u}\|_{X_k}\|\widehat{P_{k_2}v}\|_{X_{k_2}}.$$

Proof. For part (a), as before we assume $k=k_2$ and from the definition we get the left-hand side of (3.25) is dominated by

$$\sum_{k_3=-\infty}^{0}2^{k_3}\sum_{j_1,j_2,j_3\ge 0}2^{-j_3/2}\|1_{D_{k_3,j_3}}\cdot u_{k,j_1}*v_{k,j_2}\|_2, \tag{3.26}$$

where u_{k,j_1}, v_{k,j_2} are as in (3.20) and we may assume that $k_3\ge -10k$ and $j_1,j_2,j_3\le 10k$. It suffices to consider the worst case $|j_3-2k-k_3|\le 10$. Then applying (3.14) we get that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_0(\xi)i\xi\widehat{P_ku}*\widehat{P_kv}\|_{X_0}\\ \lesssim&\sum_{k_3=-10k}^{0}\sum_{j_1,j_2\geq 0}2^{-k}2^{-k_3/2}2^{k_3}2^{-k/2}2^{-k_3/2}2^{j_1/2}2^{j_2/2}\|u_{k,j_1}\|_2\|v_{k,j_2}\|_2\\ \lesssim& k2^{-3k/2}\|\widehat{P_ku}\|_{X_k}\|\widehat{P_kv}\|_{X_k},\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

which is part (a). For part (b) we assume $k=k_2$ and it follows from the definition of X_{k_1} that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_{k_1}(\xi)i\xi\widehat{P_ku}*\widehat{P_kv}\|_{X_{k_1}}\\ \lesssim&\ 2^{k_1}\sum_{j_1,j_2,j_3\geq 0}2^{-j_1/2}\|1_{D_{k_1,j_1}}u_{k,j_2}*v_{k,j_3}\|_2,\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

where u_{k,j_2},v_{k,j_3} are as in (3.20). For the same reasons as in the proof of Proposition 3.5 we may assume $j_{max}\geq 2k+k_1-10$ and $j_1,j_2,j_3\leq 10k$. We will bound the right-hand side of (3.28) case by case. The first case is that $j_1=j_{max}$ in the summation. Then we apply (3.14) and get that

$$\begin{aligned}&2^{k_1}\sum_{j_1,j_2,j_3\geq 0}2^{-j_1/2}\|1_{D_{k_1,j_1}}u_{k,j_2}*v_{k,j_3}\|_2\\ \lesssim&\ 2^{k_1}\sum_{j_1\geq 2k+k_1-10}\sum_{j_2,j_3\geq 0}2^{-j_1/2}2^{-k/2}2^{-k_1/2}2^{(j_2+j_3)/2}\|u_{k,j_2}\|_2\|v_{k,j_3}\|_2\\ \lesssim& 2^{-3k/2}\|\widehat{P_ku}\|_{X_k}\|\widehat{P_{k_2}v}\|_{X_{k_2}},\end{aligned}$$

which is acceptable. If $j_2=j_{max}$, then in this case we have better estimate for the characterization multiplier. By applying (3.15) we get

$$\begin{aligned}&2^{k_1}\sum_{j_1,j_2,j_3\geq 0}2^{-j_1/2}\|1_{D_{k_1,j_1}}u_{k,j_2}*v_{k,j_3}\|_2\\ \lesssim&\ 2^{k_1}\sum_{j_2\geq 2k+k_1-10}\sum_{j_1,j_3\geq 0}2^{-j_1/2}2^{-k}2^{(j_1+j_3)/2}\|u_{k,j_2}\|_2\|v_{k,j_3}\|_2\\ \lesssim& k2^{-2k}2^{k_1/2}\|\widehat{P_ku}\|_{X_k}\|\widehat{P_{k_2}v}\|_{X_{k_2}},\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we use $j_1\leq 10k$. The last case $j_3=j_{max}$ is identical to the case $j_2=j_{max}$ from symmetry. Therefore, we complete the proof of the proposition. ■

The main reason for us applying $\bar{F}^{-3/4}$ is the logarithmic loss of derivative in (3.25). We believe that this loss is essential. Precisely, we conjecture the following: There doesn't exist a constant $C>0$ such that for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and $u,v\in F^0$

$$\|(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_0(\xi)i\xi\widehat{P_ku}*\widehat{P_kv}\|_{X_0}\leq C2^{-3k/2}\|\widehat{P_ku}\|_{X_k}\|\widehat{P_kv}\|_{X_k}. \tag{3.29}$$

We can't prove it so far. But fortunately we can avoid the logarithmic loss in (3.25) by using a $\bar{X}_0$ structure on the low frequency[1].

---

[1] The author is grateful to Zhaohui Huo for pointing out an error in the proof of this proposition in an early version of this paper that the general bilinear estimates do not follow directly from the extension lemma. Thus we give a direct proof.

Proposition 3.9 ($\bar{X}_0$ estimate)**.** *Let* $|k_1-k_2|\leq 5$ *and* $k_1\geq 10$*. Then we have for all* $u,v\in \bar{F}^0$

$$\left\|\psi(t)\int_0^t W(t-s)P_{\leq 0}\partial_x[P_{k_1}u(s)P_{k_2}v(s)]ds\right\|_{L_x^2L_t^\infty}\lesssim 2^{-\frac{3k_1}{2}}\|\widehat{P_{k_1}u}\|_{X_{k_1}}\|\widehat{P_{k_2}u}\|_{X_{k_2}}.$$

Proof. Denote $Q(u,v)=\psi(t)\int_0^t W(t-s)P_{\leq 0}\partial_x[P_{k_1}u(s)P_{k_2}v(s)]ds$. By straightforward computations we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}\left[Q(u,v)\right](\xi,\tau) &= c\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{\widehat{\psi}(\tau-\tau')-\widehat{\psi}(\tau-\xi^3)}{\tau'-\xi^3}\eta_0(\xi)i\xi\\ &\quad\times d\tau'\int_{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2,\tau'=\tau_1+\tau_2}\widehat{P_{k_1}u}(\xi_1,\tau_1)\widehat{P_{k_2}v}(\xi_2,\tau_2).\end{aligned}$$

Fixing $\xi\in\mathbb{R}$, we decomposing the hyperplane as following

$$\begin{aligned}A_1 &= \{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2,\tau'=\tau_1+\tau_2:|\xi|\lesssim 2^{-2k_1}\};\\ A_2 &= \{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2,\tau'=\tau_1+\tau_2:|\xi|\gg 2^{-2k_1},|\tau_i-\xi_i^3|\ll 3\cdot 2^{2k_1}|\xi|,i=1,2\};\\ A_3 &= \{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2,\tau'=\tau_1+\tau_2:|\xi|\gg 2^{-2k_1},|\tau_1-\xi_1^3|\gtrsim 3\cdot 2^{2k_1}|\xi|\};\\ A_4 &= \{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2,\tau'=\tau_1+\tau_2:|\xi|\gg 2^{-2k_1},|\tau_2-\xi_2^3|\gtrsim 3\cdot 2^{2k_1}|\xi|\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then we get

$$\mathcal{F}\left[\psi(t)\cdot\int_0^t W(t-s)P_{\leq 0}\partial_x[P_{k_1}u(s)P_{k_2}v(s)]ds\right](\xi,\tau)=I+II+III,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}I &= C\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{\widehat{\psi}(\tau-\tau')-\widehat{\psi}(\tau-\xi^3)}{\tau'-\xi^3}\eta_0(\xi)i\xi\int_{A_1}\widehat{P_{k_1}u}(\xi_1,\tau_1)\widehat{P_{k_2}v}(\xi_2,\tau_2)d\tau',\\ II &= C\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{\widehat{\psi}(\tau-\tau')-\widehat{\psi}(\tau-\xi^3)}{\tau'-\xi^3}\eta_0(\xi)i\xi\int_{A_2}\widehat{P_{k_1}u}(\xi_1,\tau_1)\widehat{P_{k_2}v}(\xi_2,\tau_2)d\tau',\\ II &= C\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{\widehat{\psi}(\tau-\tau')-\widehat{\psi}(\tau-\xi^3)}{\tau'-\xi^3}\eta_0(\xi)i\xi\int_{A_3\cup A_4}\widehat{P_{k_1}u}(\xi_1,\tau_1)\widehat{P_{k_2}v}(\xi_2,\tau_2)d\tau'.\end{aligned}$$

We consider first the contribution of the term I. Using Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 4.1 (b), we get

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(I)\|_{L_x^2L_t^\infty}\lesssim\|I\|_{X_0}\lesssim\left\|(i+\tau'-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_0(\xi)i\xi\int_{A_1}\widehat{P_{k_1}u}(\xi_1,\tau_1)\widehat{P_{k_2}v}(\xi_2,\tau_2)\right\|_{X_0}.$$

Since in the area A_1 we have $|\xi|\lesssim 2^{-2k_1}$, thus we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|(i+\tau'-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_0(\xi)i\xi\int_{A_1}\widehat{P_{k_1}u}(\xi_1,\tau_1)\widehat{P_{k_2}v}(\xi_2,\tau_2)\right\|_{X_0}\\ \lesssim &\sum_{k_3\leq -2k_1+10}\sum_{j_3\geq 0}2^{-j_3/2}2^{k_3}\sum_{j_1\geq 0,j_2\geq 0}\|1_{D_{k_3,j_3}}\cdot u_{k_1,j_1}*v_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^2}\end{aligned}$$

where

$$u_{k_1,j_1}(\xi,\tau)=\eta_{k_1}(\xi)\eta_{j_1}(\tau-\xi^3)\widehat{u}(\xi,\tau),v_{k_1,j_1}(\xi,\tau)=\eta_{k_1}(\xi)\eta_{j_1}(\tau-\xi^3)\widehat{v}(\xi,\tau).(3.30)$$

Using Proposition 3.4 (iii), then we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(I)\|_{L_x^2L_t^\infty} &\lesssim \sum_{k_3\leq -2k_1+10}\sum_{j_i\geq 0} 2^{-j_3/2}2^{k_3}2^{j_{min}/2}2^{k_3/2}\|u_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^2}\|v_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^2}\\ &\lesssim 2^{-3k_1}\|\widehat{P_{k_1}u}\|_{X_{k_1}}\|\widehat{P_{k_2}u}\|_{X_{k_2}},\end{aligned}$$

which suffices to give the bound for the term I.

Next we consider the contribution of the term III. As for the term I, Using Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 4.1 (b), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(III)\|_{L_x^2L_t^\infty} &\lesssim \left\|(i+\tau'-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_0(\xi)i\xi\int_{A_3\cup A_4}\widehat{P_{k_1}u}(\xi_1,\tau_1)\widehat{P_{k_2}v}(\xi_2,\tau_2)\right\|_{X_0}\\ &\lesssim \sum_{k_3\leq 0}\sum_{j_3\geq 0}2^{-j_3/2}2^{k_3}\sum_{j_1\geq 0,j_2\geq 0}\|1_{D_{k_3,j_3}}\cdot u_{k_1,j_1}*v_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^2}\end{aligned}$$

Clearly we may assume $j_3\leq 10k_1$ in the summation above. Without loss of generality, we assume $|\tau_1-\xi_1^3|\gtrsim 3|\xi\xi_1\xi_2|$. Using Proposition 3.4 (iii), then we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(III)\|_{L_x^2L_t^\infty} &\lesssim \sum_{k_3\leq 0}\sum_{j_1\geq k_3+2k_1-10,j_2,j_3\geq 0} 2^{k_3}2^{j_2/2}2^{-k_1}\|u_{k_1,j_1}\|_{L^2}\|v_{k_2,j_2}\|_{L^2}\\ &\lesssim k_12^{-2k_1}\|\widehat{P_{k_1}u}\|_{X_{k_1}}\|\widehat{P_{k_2}u}\|_{X_{k_2}},\end{aligned}$$

which suffices to give the bound for the term III.

Now we consider the contribution of the term II. From the proof of the dyadic bilinear estimates, we know this term is the main contribution. By computation we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_t^{-1}(II) &= \psi(t)\int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\xi^3}\eta_0(\xi)i\xi\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}e^{is(\tau_1+\tau_2)}\\ &\quad\times\int_{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2}u_{k_1}(\xi_1,\tau_1)v_{k_2}(\xi_2,\tau_2)\ d\tau_1d\tau_2ds\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}u_{k_1}(\xi_1,\tau_1) &= \eta_{k_1}(\xi_1)1_{\{|\tau_1-\xi_1^3|\ll 3\cdot 2^{2k_1}|\xi|\}}\widehat{u}(\xi_1,\tau_1),\\ v_{k_2}(\xi_2,\tau_2) &= \eta_{k_2}(\xi_2)1_{\{|\tau_2-\xi_2^3|\ll 3\cdot 2^{2k_1}|\xi|\}}\widehat{v}(\xi_2,\tau_2).\end{aligned}$$

By a change of variable $\tau_1'=\tau_1-\xi_1^3$, $\tau_2'=\tau_2-\xi_2^3$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_t^{-1}(II) &= \psi(t)e^{it\xi^3}\eta_0(\xi)i\xi\int_0^t e^{-is\xi^3}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}e^{is(\tau_1+\tau_2)}\\ &\quad\times\int_{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2}e^{is\xi_1^3}u_{k_1}(\xi_1,\tau_1+\xi_1^3)e^{is\xi_2^3}v_{k_2}(\xi_2,\tau_2+\xi_2^3)\ d\tau_1d\tau_2ds\\ &= \psi(t)e^{it\xi^3}\eta_0(\xi)\xi\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}e^{it(\tau_1+\tau_2)}\int_{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2}\frac{e^{it(\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3-\xi^3)}-e^{-it(\tau_1+\tau_2)}}{\tau_1+\tau_2-\xi^3+\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3}\\ &\quad\times u_{k_1}(\xi_1,\tau_1+\xi_1^3)v_{k_2}(\xi_2,\tau_2+\xi_2^3)\ d\tau_1d\tau_2\\ &:= \mathcal{F}_t^{-1}(II_1)-\mathcal{F}_t^{-1}(II_2).\end{aligned}$$

For the contribution of the term II_2, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_t^{-1}(II_2)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\psi(t)e^{it\xi^3}\eta_0(\xi)\xi\int_{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2}\frac{u_{k_1}(\xi_1,\tau_1+\xi_1^3)v_{k_2}(\xi_2,\tau_2+\xi_2^3)}{\tau_1+\tau_2-\xi^3+\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3}\ d\tau_1d\tau_2.$$

Since in the integral area we have $|\tau_1+\tau_2-\xi^3+\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3|\sim|\xi\xi_1\xi_2|$, thus we get from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(II_2)\|_{L^2_xL^\infty_t} &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\left\|\int_{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2}\xi\frac{u_{k_1}(\xi_1,\tau_1+\xi_1^3)v_{k_2}(\xi_2,\tau_2+\xi_2^3)}{\tau_1+\tau_2-\xi^3+\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3}\right\|_{L^2_\xi}d\tau_1d\tau_2\\ &\lesssim 2^{-\frac{3k_1}{2}}\|\widehat{P_{k_1}u}\|_{X_{k_1}}\|\widehat{P_{k_2}u}\|_{X_{k_2}}.\end{aligned}$$

To prove the proposition, it remains to prove the following

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(II_1)\|_{L^2_xL^\infty_t}\lesssim 2^{-3k_1/2}\|\widehat{P_{k_1}u}\|_{X_{k_1}}\|\widehat{P_{k_2}u}\|_{X_{k_2}}.$$

Compare the term II_1 with the following term II_1':

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_t^{-1}(II_1') &= \psi(t)e^{it\xi^3}\eta_0(\xi)\xi\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}e^{it(\tau_1+\tau_2)}\int_{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2}\frac{e^{it(\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3-\xi^3)}}{-\xi^3+\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3}\\ &\quad\times u_{k_1}(\xi_1,\tau_1+\xi_1^3)v_{k_2}(\xi_2,\tau_2+\xi_2^3)\ d\tau_1d\tau_2.\end{aligned}$$

For the term II_1' we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_t^{-1}(II_1') &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\psi(t)\eta_0(\xi)e^{it(\tau_1+\tau_2)}1_{\{|\xi|\gg|\tau_1|2^{-2k_1}\}}1_{\{|\xi|\gg|\tau_2|2^{-2k_1}\}}\\ &\quad\times\int_{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2}\frac{e^{it(\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3)}}{-3\xi_1\xi_2}\mathcal{F}(f_{\tau_1})(\xi_1)\mathcal{F}(g_{\tau_2})(\xi_2)\ d\tau_1d\tau_2.\end{aligned}$$

where for $\tau_1,\tau_2\in\mathbb{R}$, we set

$$\mathcal{F}(f_{\tau_1})(\xi)=\widehat{P_{k_1}u}(\xi,\tau_1+\xi^3),\ \mathcal{F}(g_{\tau_2})(\xi)=\widehat{P_{k_2}v}(\xi,\tau_2+\xi^3).$$

Since it is easy to see that (actually we need a smooth version of $1_{\{|\xi|\gg\lambda\}}$): $\forall\ \lambda>0$ we have

$$\|\mathcal{F}_x^{-1}1_{\{|\xi|\gg\lambda\}}\mathcal{F}_xu\|_{L^2_xL^\infty_t}\lesssim\|u\|_{L^2_xL^\infty_t},$$

thus we get from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(II_1')\|_{L^2_xL^\infty_t} &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\|W(t)\partial_x^{-1}f_{\tau_1}W(t)\partial_x^{-1}f_{\tau_2}\|_{L^2_xL^\infty_t}d\tau_1d\tau_2\\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\|W(t)\partial_x^{-1}f_{\tau_1})\|_{L^4_xL^\infty_t}\|W(t)\partial_x^{-1}f_{\tau_2}\|_{L^4_xL^\infty_t}d\tau_1d\tau_2\\ &\lesssim 2^{-\frac{3k_1}{2}}\|\widehat{P_{k_1}u}\|_{X_{k_1}}\|\widehat{P_{k_2}u}\|_{X_{k_2}},\end{aligned}$$

which gives the bound for the term II_1'.

To prove the proposition, it remains to prove the following

$$\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(II_1-II_1')\|_{L^2_xL^\infty_t}\lesssim 2^{-3k_1/2}\|\widehat{P_{k_1}u}\|_{X_{k_1}}\|\widehat{P_{k_2}u}\|_{X_{k_2}}.$$

Since in the integral area we have $|\tau_i|\ll 2^{2k_1}|\xi|$, $i=1,2$, thus we get in the hyperplane

$$\frac{1}{\tau_1+\tau_2-\xi^3+\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3}=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{3\xi\xi_1\xi_2}\left(\frac{\tau_1+\tau_2}{3\xi\xi_1\xi_2}\right)^n$$

and then

$$\frac{1}{\tau_1+\tau_2-\xi^3+\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3}-\frac{1}{-\xi^3+\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3}=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{3\xi\xi_1\xi_2}\left(\frac{\tau_1+\tau_2}{3\xi\xi_1\xi_2}\right)^n.$$

Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{F}_t^{-1}(II_1 - II_1')\\
=\ &\psi(t)\eta_0(\xi)\xi\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it(\tau_1+\tau_2)}\int_{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{3\xi\xi_1\xi_2}\left(\frac{\tau_1+\tau_2}{3\xi\xi_1\xi_2}\right)^n\\
&\times\ e^{it(\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3)}u_{k_1}(\xi_1,\tau_1+\xi_1^3)v_{k_2}(\xi_2,\tau_2+\xi_2^3)\ d\tau_1 d\tau_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then decomposing the low frequency, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{F}_t^{-1}(II_1 - II_1')\\
=\ &\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it(\tau_1+\tau_2)}\sum_{2^{k_3}\gg 2^{-2k_1}\max(|\tau_1|,|\tau_2|)}\psi(t)e^{it(\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3)}\chi_{k_3}(\xi)\\
&\times\int_{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2}\left(\frac{\tau_1+\tau_2}{3\xi\xi_1\xi_2}\right)^n\frac{u_{k_1}(\xi_1,\tau_1+\xi_1^3)v_{k_2}(\xi_2,\tau_2+\xi_2^3)}{3\xi_1\xi_2}\ d\tau_1 d\tau_2
\end{aligned}$$

We rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{F}_t^{-1}(II_1 - II_1')\\
=\ &\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{it(\tau_1+\tau_2)}\sum_{2^{k_3}\gg 2^{-2k_1}\max(|\tau_1|,|\tau_2|)}\psi(t)e^{it(\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3)}\chi_{k_3}(\xi)(\xi/2^{k_3})^{-n}\\
&\times\ 2^{-nk_3}\int_{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2}\left(\frac{\tau_1+\tau_2}{3\xi_1\xi_2}\right)^n\frac{u_{k_1}(\xi_1,\tau_1+\xi_1^3)v_{k_2}(\xi_2,\tau_2+\xi_2^3)}{3\xi_1\xi_2}\ d\tau_1 d\tau_2
\end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $\chi_{k_3}(\xi)(\xi/2^{k_3})^{-n}$ is a multiplier for the space $L_x^2L_t^\infty$ and as for the term II_1', we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(II_1 - II_1')\|_{L_x^2L_t^\infty}\\
\lesssim\ &\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\sum_{2^{k_3}\gg 2^{-2k_1}\max(|\tau_1|,|\tau_2|)} C^n|\tau_1+\tau_2|^n 2^{-nk_3}\\
&\times\left\|\psi(t)e^{it(\xi_1^3+\xi_2^3)}\int_{\xi=\xi_1+\xi_2}\frac{\mathcal{F}(f_{\tau_1})(\xi_1)\mathcal{F}(g_{\tau_2})(\xi_2)}{3\xi_1^{n+1}\xi_2^{n+1}}\right\|_{L_x^2L_t^\infty} d\tau_1 d\tau_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 3.1 and summing on k_3, we get that for some $M\gg 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(II_1 - II_1')\|_{L_x^2L_t^\infty}\\
\lesssim\ &\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\sum_{2^{k_3}\gg 2^{-2k_1}\max(|\tau_1|,|\tau_2|)} C^n|\tau_1+\tau_2|^n 2^{-nk_3}2^{-2nk_1}\\
&\times\ 2^{-3k_1/2}\|\mathcal{F}(f_{\tau_1})\|_{L^2}\|\mathcal{F}(g_{\tau_2})\|_{L^2}d\tau_1 d\tau_2\\
\lesssim\ &\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(C/M)^n\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}2^{-3k_1/2}\|\mathcal{F}(f_{\tau_1})\|_{L^2}\|\mathcal{F}(g_{\tau_2})\|_{L^2}d\tau_1 d\tau_2\\
\lesssim\ &2^{-3k_1/2}\|\widehat{P_{k_1}u}\|_{X_{k_1}}\|\widehat{P_{k_2}u}\|_{X_{k_2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we complete the proof of the proposition. ■

4. Proof of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2

We construct first a strong local solution to the KdV equation (1.1) via contraction principle. The main ingredients are the dyadic bilinear estimates obtained in the last section. We observe first that the KdV equation (1.1) is invariant under the following scaling transform: for $\lambda > 0$

$$u(x,t) \to \lambda^2 u(\lambda x, \lambda^3 t),\ \phi(x) \to \lambda^2 \phi(\lambda x). \tag{4.1}$$

$\dot{H}^{-3/2}$ is the critical space to (1.1) in the sense that $\|\lambda^2\phi(\lambda\cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^{-3/2}} = \|\phi\|_{\dot{H}^{-3/2}}$. From the fact that

$$\|\lambda^2\phi(\lambda x)\|_{H^{-3/4}} \lesssim \lambda^{3/2}\|\phi\|_{H^{-3/4}} + \lambda^{3/4}\|\phi\|_{H^{-3/4}}$$

then by taking λ sufficiently small we may assume

$$\|\phi\|_{H^{-3/4}} \leq \epsilon \ll 1. \tag{4.2}$$

Then we only need to construct the solution of (1.1) on $[-1,1]$ under the condition (4.2). From Duhamel's principle, (1.1) is equivalent to the integral equation

$$u(t) = W(t)\phi - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t W(t-\tau)\partial_x(u^2(\tau))d\tau. \tag{4.3}$$

We will apply a fixed point argument to solve the following truncated version

$$u(t) = \psi(\frac{t}{4})\left[W(t)\phi - \int_0^t W(t-\tau)\partial_x(\psi^2(\tau)u^2(\tau))d\tau\right]. \tag{4.4}$$

It is easy to see that if u solves (4.4) then u is a solution of (4.3) and hence of (1.1) on the time interval $[-1,1]$.

Proposition 4.1 (Linear estimates). *(a) Assume $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi \in H^s$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|\psi(t)W(t)\phi\|_{\bar{F}^s} \leq C\|\phi\|_{H^s}. \tag{4.5}$$

(b) Assume $s \in \mathbb{R}, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and u satisfies $(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\mathcal{F}(u) \in X_k$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\left\|\mathcal{F}\left[\psi(t)\int_0^t W(t-s)(u(s))ds\right]\right\|_{X_k} \leq C\|(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\mathcal{F}(u)\|_{X_k}. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. Part (a) follows from Proposition 3.1 and the definitions. Part (b) has appeared in many literatures, see for example [8, 7]. ■

For $u, v \in \bar{F}^s$ we define the bilinear operator

$$B(u,v) = \psi(\frac{t}{4})\int_0^t W(t-\tau)\partial_x\big(\psi^2(\tau)u(\tau)\cdot v(\tau)\big)d\tau. \tag{4.7}$$

In order to apply a fixed point argument to (4.4), all the issues are then reduced to show the boundness of $B : \bar{F}^s \times \bar{F}^s \to \bar{F}^s$.

Proposition 4.2 (Bilinear estimates). *Assume $-3/4 \leq s \leq 0$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|B(u,v)\|_{\bar{F}^s} \leq C(\|u\|_{\bar{F}^s}\|v\|_{\bar{F}^{-3/4}} + \|u\|_{\bar{F}^{-3/4}}\|v\|_{\bar{F}^s}) \tag{4.8}$$

hold for any $u, v \in \bar{F}^s$.

Proof. In view of definition, we get

$$\|B(u,v)\|_{\bar{F}^s}^2=\|P_{\leq 0}B(u,v)\|_{\bar{X}_0}^2+\sum_{k_1\geq 1}2^{2k_1 s}\|\eta_{k_1}(\xi)\mathcal{F}[B(u,v)]\|_{X_{k_1}}^2. \tag{4.9}$$

We consider first the contribution of the second term on the right-hand side of (4.9). By decomposing u,v we have

$$\|\eta_{k_1}(\xi)\mathcal{F}[B(u,v)]\|_{X_{k_1}}\lesssim\sum_{k_2,k_3\geq 0}\|\eta_{k_1}(\xi)\mathcal{F}[B(P_{k_2}(u),P_{k_3}(v))]\|_{X_{k_1}}. \tag{4.10}$$

From Proposition 4.1 (b) the right-hand side of (4.10) is dominated by

$$\sum_{k_2,k_3\geq 0}\|(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_{k_1}(\xi)i\xi\widehat{\psi(t)P_{k_2}}u*\widehat{\psi(t)P_{k_3}}v)\|_{X_{k_1}}. \tag{4.11}$$

From symmetry we assume $k_2\leq k_3$ in (4.11). It suffices to prove

$$\Big(\sum_{k_1\geq 1}2^{2k_1 s}\big[\sum_{k_2,k_3\geq 0}\|(i+\tau-\xi^3)^{-1}\eta_{k_1}(\xi)i\xi\widehat{\psi(t)P_{k_2}}u*\widehat{\psi(t)P_{k_3}}v)\|_{X_{k_1}}\big]^2\Big)^{1/2}$$
$$\lesssim\|u\|_{\bar{F}^{-3/4}}\|v\|_{\bar{F}^s}. \tag{4.12}$$

If $k_{max}\leq 20$ then applying Proposition 3.7 and from (2.5) we get that (4.11) is dominated by

$$\sum_{k_{max}\leq 20}\|P_{k_2}u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\|P_{k_3}v\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}, \tag{4.13}$$

which suffices to give the bound (4.12) in this case since it's easy to see that we have $\|P_k u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\lesssim\|P_k u\|_{X_k}$ for $k\geq 1$ and $\|P_k u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\lesssim\|P_k u\|_{\bar{X}_k}$ for $k=0$. Assuming $k_{max}\geq 20$ in (4.11), we have three cases. If $|k_1-k_3|\leq 5, k_2\leq k_1-10$, then applying Proposition 3.5 (a) for $k_2=0$ and (b) for $k_2\geq 1$; If $|k_1-k_3|\leq 5, k_1-9\leq k_2\leq k_3$, then applying Proposition 3.6; If $|k_2-k_3|\leq 5, 1\leq k_1\leq k_2-5$, then applying Proposition 3.8 (b). We easily get the bound (4.12) as desired.

To prove Proposition 4.2, it remains to prove that

$$\|B(u,v)\|_{\bar{X}_0}\leq C(\|u\|_{\bar{F}^s}\|v\|_{\bar{F}^{-3/4}}+\|u\|_{\bar{F}^{-3/4}}\|v\|_{\bar{F}^s}). \tag{4.14}$$

By decomposing u,v as before we obtain

$$\|B(u,v)\|_{\bar{X}_0}\leq\sum_{k_2,k_3\geq 0}\|B(P_{k_2}u,P_{k_3}v)\|_{\bar{X}_0}. \tag{4.15}$$

If $\max(k_2,k_3)\leq 10$, then from (2.6) and Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 3.7 we obtain that

$$\|B(P_{k_2}u,P_{k_3}v)\|_{\bar{X}_0}\lesssim\|P_{k_2}u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}\|P_{k_3}v\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2},$$

which suffices to give the bound (4.14) in this case. If $\max(k_2,k_3)\geq 10$, then we must have $|k_2-k_3|\leq 5$. Then from Proposition 3.9 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|B(u,v)\|_{\bar{X}_0}&\leq\sum_{|k_2-k_3|\leq 5,\ k_2,k_3\geq 10}2^{-3k_2/2}\|\mathcal{F}(P_{k_2}u)\|_{X_{k_2}}\|\mathcal{F}(P_{k_3}v)\|_{X_{k_3}}\\&\lesssim\|u\|_{\bar{F}^{-3/4}}\|v\|_{\bar{F}^{-3/4}}\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

which gives (4.14) as desired. Thus we complete the proof of the proposition. ■

With a standard argument (see for example, Lemma 4, [3]), we get that there is a unique solution u to (4.4) such that $\|u\|_{\bar{F}^{-3/4}}\leq C\epsilon_0$. So far, we have proved Theorem 1.1 (a). The rest of Theorem 1.1 also follow from standard argument.

In the rest of this section we prove Theorem 1.2. The standard way to extend a local solution to a global one is to make use of the conservation laws. It is well-known that the KdV equation is completely integrable and hence has infinite conservation laws. However, there is no conservation laws below L^2, and thus one can not automatically get global well-posedness below L^2. J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka and T. Tao developed the modified energy (I-method) to prove global well-posedness below the energy norm. We adapt I-method to extend the local solution in $H^{-3/4}$ and refer the readers to [5] for many details. We define $I-operator$ by

$$\widehat{If}(\xi)=m(\xi)\widehat{f}(\xi),$$

where the multiplier $m(\xi)$ is smooth, monotone, and of the form for $N\geq 1$

$$m(\xi)=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}1, & |\xi|<N,\\ N^{-s}|\xi|^{s}, & |\xi|>2N.\end{array}\right. \tag{4.17}$$

We state a variant local well-posedness result which follows from slight argument in the last section and from the same reasons as in [5]. This is used to iterate the solution in the I-method.

Proposition 4.3. *Let* $-3/4\leq s\leq 0$. *Assume* ϕ *satisfies* $\|I\phi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\leq\epsilon_0\ll 1$. *Then there exists a unique solution* u *to* (1.1) *on* $[-1,1]$ *such that*

$$\|Iu\|_{\bar{F}^s(1)}\leq C\epsilon_0. \tag{4.18}$$

Then it suffices to control $\|Iu\|_{L^2}$ for all t. Let $g:\mathbb{R}^k\to\mathbb{C}$ be a function. We say g is symmetric if $g(\xi_1,\dots,\xi_k)=g(\sigma(\xi_1,\dots,\xi_k))$ for all $\sigma\in S_k$, the group of all permutations on k objects. The symmetrization of g is the function

$$[g]_{sym}(\xi_1,\xi_2,\dots,\xi_k)=\frac{1}{k!}\sum_{\sigma\in S_k}g(\sigma(\xi_1,\xi_2,\dots,\xi_k)). \tag{4.19}$$

We define a $k-linear$ functional associated to the multiplier g acting on k functions $u_1,\dots,u_k$,

$$\Lambda_k(g;u_1,\dots,u_k)=\int_{\xi_1+\ldots+\xi_k=0}g(\xi_1,\dots,\xi_k)\widehat{u_1}(\xi_1)\ldots\widehat{u_k}(\xi_k). \tag{4.20}$$

We will often apply Λ_k to k copies of the same function u. $\Lambda_k(g;u,\dots,u)$ may simply be written $\Lambda_k(g)$. By the symmetry of the measure on hyperplane, we have $\Lambda_k(g)=\Lambda_k([g]_{sym})$. For $k\in\mathbb{N}$ denote

$$\alpha_k=\xi_1^3+\ldots+\xi_k^3.$$

We define the modified energy $E_I^2(t)$ by

$$E_I^2(t)=\|Iu(t)\|_{L^2}^2=\Lambda_2(m(\xi_1)m(\xi_2)). \tag{4.21}$$

Form the new modified energy

$$E_I^3(t)=E_I^2(t)+\Lambda_3(\sigma_3),$$
$$E_I^4(t)=E_I^3(t)+\Lambda_4(\sigma_4),$$

where

$$\sigma_3=-\frac{M_3}{\alpha_3},\quad M_3(\xi_1,\xi_2,\xi_3)=-i[m(\xi_1)m(\xi_2+\xi_3)(\xi_2+\xi_3)]_{sym};$$

$$\sigma_4=-\frac{M_4}{\alpha_4},\quad M_4(\xi_1,\xi_2,\xi_3,\xi_4)=-i\frac{3}{2}[\sigma_3(\xi_1,\xi_2,\xi_3+\xi_4)(\xi_3+\xi_4)]_{sym}.$$

Proposition 4.4. *Let I be defined with the multiplier m of the form* (4.17) *and $s=-3/4$. Then*

$$|E_I^4(t)-E_I^2(t)|\lesssim\|Iu(t)\|_{L^2}^3+\|Iu(t)\|_{L^2}^4. \tag{4.22}$$

Proof. For $s=-\frac{3}{4}+$ this was proved in Lemma 6.1 [5]. But it is easy to see that the arguments actually work for $s=-3/4$. ■

Since $E_I^2(t)$ is very close to $E_I^4(t)$, then we will control $E_I^4(t)$ and hence control $E_I^2(t)$. In order to control the increase of $E_I^4(t)$, we need to control its derivative

$$\frac{d}{dt}E_I^4(t)=\Lambda_5(M_5),$$

where

$$M_5(\xi_1,\dots,\xi_5)=-2i[\sigma_4(\xi_1,\xi_2,\xi_3,\xi_4+\xi_5)(\xi_4+\xi_5)]_{sym}.$$

Proposition 4.5. *Assume $I\subset\mathbb{R}$ with $|I|\lesssim 1$. Let $0\le k_1\le\ldots\le k_5$ and $k_4\ge 10$. Then we have*

$$\left|\int_I\int\prod_{i=1}^5 P_{k_i}(w_i)(x,t)dxdt\right|\lesssim 2^{\frac{5}{12}(k_1+k_2+k_3)}2^{-k_4}2^{-k_5}\prod_{j=1}^5\|\widehat{P_{k_j}(w_j)}\|_{X_{k_j}}, \tag{4.23}$$

where if $k_j=0$ then X_{k_j} is replaced by $\bar{X}_{k_j}$ on the right-hand side.

Proof. From Hölder's inequality the left-hand side of (4.23) is dominated by

$$\prod_{i=1}^3\|P_{k_i}(w_i)\|_{L_x^3L_{t\in I}^\infty}\cdot\|P_{k_4}(w_4)\|_{L_x^\infty L_t^2}\cdot\|P_{k_5}(w_5)\|_{L_x^\infty L_t^2}.$$

For $\|P_{k_4}(w_4)\|_{L_x^\infty L_t^2}$ and $\|P_{k_5}(w_5)\|_{L_x^\infty L_t^2}$ we use Proposition 3.3. For $\|P_{k_i}(w_i)\|_{L_x^3L_{t\in I}^\infty}$ we use interpolation between $\|P_{k_i}(w_i)\|_{L_x^2L_{t\in I}^\infty}$ and $\|P_{k_i}(w_i)\|_{L_x^4L_{t\in I}^\infty}$, and Proposition 3.3. ■

Proposition 4.6. *Let $\delta\lesssim 1$. Assume m is of the form* (4.17) *with $s=-3/4$, then*

$$\left|\int_0^\delta\Lambda_5(M_5;u_1,\dots,u_5)dt\right|\lesssim N^{-\frac{15}{4}}\prod_{j=1}^5\|Iu_j\|_{\bar{F}^0(\delta)}. \tag{4.24}$$

Proof. Following the proof of Lemma 5.2 [5], it suffices to prove that

$$\sum_{k_1,\dots,k_5\ge 0}\left|\int_0^\delta\Lambda_5\left(\prod_{i=1}^3\frac{1}{(N+N_i)m(N_i)}\frac{1}{m(N_4)}\frac{1}{m(N_5)};P_{k_1}u_1,\dots,P_{k_5}u_5\right)dt\right|$$
$$\lesssim N^{-\frac{15}{4}}\prod_{i=1}^5\|u_j\|_{\bar{F}^0(\delta)}.$$

Where $N_i=2^{k_i}$. From symmetry we may assume $N_1\ge N_2\ge N_3$ and $N_4\ge N_5$ and two of the $N_i\gtrsim N$. We fix the extension $\widetilde{u}_i$ such that $\|\widetilde{u}_i\|_{\bar{F}^0}\lesssim 2\|u_i\|_{\bar{F}^0(\delta)}$. For simplicity, we still denote u_i.

The form (4.17) with $s=-3/4$ implies that $\frac{1}{(N+N_i)m(N_i)}\lesssim N^{-3/4}\langle N_i\rangle^{-1/4}$ and $\frac{1}{m(N_4)m(N_5)}\lesssim N^{-3/2}N_4^{3/4}N_5^{3/4}$. Therefore we need to control

$$N^{-\frac{15}{4}}\sum_{k_i}\int_0^\delta\Lambda_5\left(\langle N_1\rangle^{-1/4}\langle N_2\rangle^{-1/4}\langle N_3\rangle^{-1/4}N_4^{3/4}N_5^{3/4};u_1,\dots,u_5\right)dt. \tag{4.25}$$

If $N_2 \sim N_1 \gtrsim N$, $N_4 \lesssim N_2$, we consider the worst case $N_1 \geq N_2 \geq N_4 \geq N_5 \geq N_3$. From (4.23) we get

$$(4.25) \quad \lesssim \quad N^{-\frac{15}{4}} \sum_{N_i} \langle N_1 \rangle^{-5/4} \langle N_2 \rangle^{-5/4} \langle N_3 \rangle^{1/6} N_4^{7/6} N_5^{7/6} \prod_{i=1}^{5} \|\widehat{P_{k_i} u}\|_{X_{k_i}}$$

$$\lesssim \quad N^{-\frac{15}{4}} \prod_{j=1}^{5} \|I u_j\|_{\bar{F}^0(\delta)}. \tag{4.26}$$

The rest Cases $N_4 \sim N_5 \gtrsim N$, $N_1 \lesssim N_5$ or $N_1 \sim N_4 \gtrsim N$ follow in a similar ways. We omit the details. ■

With these propositions, one can easily get global well-posedness of the KdV equation using the same argument as in Section 6.4 [5]. Moreover, we obtain that our global-in-time solution satisfies

$$\|u(t)\|_{H^{-3/4}} \lesssim (1 + |t|) \cdot \|\phi\|_{H^{-3/4}}. \tag{4.27}$$

The proof for mKdV is just identical to the one in [5], since it is easy to see that the Lemmas in Section 9.1 and 9.2 also hold for $s = 1/4$.

Acknowledgment. The author is very grateful to Professor Carlos E. Kenig for encouraging the author to work on this problem and helpful conversations, and to Professor Terence Tao for the precious suggestions. The author also would like to thank Professor Lizhong Peng and Professor Baoxiang Wang for the numerous supports and encouragements. This work is supported in part by RFDP of China No. 20060001010, the National Science Foundation of China, grant 10571004; and the 973 Project Foundation of China, grant 2006CB805902, and the Innovation Group Foundation of NSFC, grant 10621061.

References

[1] I. Bejenaru, T. Tao, Sharp well-posedness and ill-posedness results for a quadratic non-linear Schrödinger equation, J. Funct. Anal. 233 (2006), 228-259.

[2] J. Bourgain, Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations I, II. Geom. Funct. Anal., 3:107-156, 209-262, 1993.

[3] M. Cannone, Harmonic analysis tools for solving the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, Handbook of mathematical fluid dynamics, VIII, Edited by S. J. Friedlander and D. Serre, 2004.

[4] M. Christ, J. Colliander, and T. Tao, Asymptotics, frequency modulation and low regularity ill-posedness for canonical defocusing equations, Amer. J. Math. 125 (2003), no. 6, 1235-1293.

[5] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, T. Tao, Sharp global well-posedness for KdV and modified KdV on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{T}$, J. Amer. Math. Soc., 16(3);705-749, 2003.

[6] Z. Guo, L. Peng, B. Wang, Decay estimates for a class of wave equations, Journal of Functional Analysis, 254/6 (2008) 1642-1660.

[7] Z. Guo, B. Wang, Global well posedness and inviscid limit for the Korteweg-de Vries-Burgers equation, Preprint arXiv:0803.2450v2.

[8] A. D. Ionescu, C. E. Kenig, Global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation in low-regularity spaces, J. Amer. Math. Soc., 20 (2007), no. 3, 753-798.

[9] A. D. Ionescu, C. E. Kenig, D. Tataru, Global well-posedness of KP-I initial-value problem in the energy space, Invent. Math. 173 (2008), no. 2, 265-304.

[10] C. Kenig, G. Ponce, L. Vega, Well-posedness and scattering results for the generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation via the contraction principle, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics 46 (1993), no. 4, 527-620.

[11] C. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega. On the ill-posedness of some canonical dispersive equations. Duke Math. J., 106(3):617-633, 2001. MR 2002c:35265

[12] C. Kenig, G. Ponce, L. Vega, A bilinear estimate with applications to the KdV equation. J. Amer. Math. Soc., 9:573-603, 1996. MR 96k:35159.

[13] C. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega, Well-posedness of the initial value problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation, J. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 4, 1991, pp. 323-347.

[14] C. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega, Oscillatory integrals and regularity of dispersive equations, Indiana University Math. J., Vol. 40, 1991, pp. 33-69

[15] S. Klainerman and M. Machedon. Smoothing estimates for null forms and applications. Internat. Math. Res. Notices, 9, 1994. MR 95i:58174

[16] N. Kishimoto, Well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation at the critical regularity, preprint.

[17] D. J. Korteweg and G. de Vries, On the change of form of long waves advancing in a rectangular canal, and on a new type of long stationary waves, Philos. Mag. 39 (1895), 422-443.

[18] L. Molinet, F. Ribaud, On the low regularity of the Korteweg-de Vries-Burgers equation, Internat. Math. Res. Notices, no. 37, 2002.

[19] K. Nakanishi, H. Takaoka, and Y. Tsutsumi. Counterexamples to bilinear estimates related to the KdV equation and the nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Methods of Appl. Anal. 8(4):569-578, 2001.

[20] T. Tao, Multiplinear weighted convolution of L^2 functions and applications to nonlinear dispersive equations. Amer. J. Math., 123(5):839-908, 2001. MR 2002k:35283

[21] T. Tao, Scattering for the quartic generalised Korteweg-de Vries equation, J. Differential Equations 232 (2007) 623-651.

[22] D. Tataru, Local and global results for wave maps I, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **23** (1998), 1781-1793.

LMAM, School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
E-mail address: `zihuaguo@math.pku.edu.cn`